

**BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF
NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION
OF THE STATE OF MONTANA**

* * * * *

**APPLICATION TO CHANGE WATER RIGHT)
NO. 41G 30111445 BY WIDEMAN, CHARLES)
J & DEBRA L HANNEMAN TRUST)**

**PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION TO
GRANT CHANGE**

* * * * *

On September 11, 2017, Charles J. Wideman & Debra L. Hanneman Trust (Applicant) submitted Application to Change Water Right No. 41G 30111445 to change Water Right Claim No. 41G 120778-00 to the Helena Regional Office of the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (Department or DNRC). The Department published receipt of the Application on its website. The Department sent Applicant a deficiency letter under §85-2-302, Montana Code Annotated (MCA), dated March 9, 2018. The Applicant responded with information dated April 3, 2018. The Application was determined to be correct and complete as of August 12, 2021. An Environmental Assessment for this Application was completed on September 16, 2021.

INFORMATION

The Department considered the following information submitted by the Applicant, which is contained in the administrative record.

Application as filed:

- Application to Change Water Right, Form 606-IR
- Attachments
- Maps: Topographic Map with existing and proposed point of diversion (POD), and general location of irrigated field, Google Earth Maps depicting irrigated field, existing and proposed POD

Information Received after Application Filed

- Deficiency letter response dated April 3, 2018

Information within the Department's Possession/Knowledge

- Aerial photos and topographic maps
- Water right records, including file for the Statement of Claim proposed to be changed
- USDA Web Soil Survey
- DNRC Technical Report
- Montana Natural Heritage Program Species of Concern List

- Statute and Administrative Rules
- Environmental Assessment dated September 16, 2021

The Department has fully reviewed and considered the evidence and argument submitted in this Application and preliminarily determines the following pursuant to the Montana Water Use Act (Title 85, chapter 2, part 3, part 4, MCA).

WATER RIGHT TO BE CHANGED

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Applicant seeks to change the point of diversion (POD) for Water Right Claim No. 41G 120778 for 315.0 GPM and 49.6 AF diverted volume from Whitetail Deer Creek for the purpose of sprinkler irrigation of 19.0 acres located in the SWSE of Section 28, T2N, R4W, Jefferson County. The period of diversion and use is May 1 to October 31, with a priority date of September 12, 1902. The point of diversion is located on Whitetail Deer Creek in the NENWNE of Section 33, T2N, R4W, Jefferson County. Water is conveyed through a pump and pipeline system to a wheel-line sprinkler to irrigate the place of use (POU). The POU is approximately 3 miles north of Whitehall, Montana.

Table 1: WATER RIGHT PROPOSED FOR CHANGE

W.R. NO.	FLOW	VOLUME	PURPOSE	PERIOD OF USE	PLACE OF USE	POINT(S) OF DIVERSION	PRIORITY DATE
41G 120778	315.0 GPM	49.6 AF	Sprinkler Irrigation	5/1- 10/31	SWSE Sec. 28, T2N, R4W	NENWNE Sec. 33, T2N, R4W	9/12/1902


2. A previous change authorization was issued on September 15, 2009 that authorized a change in the POD from the NESWSW of Section 21, T2N, R4W to the NENWNE of Section 33, T2N, R4W, both in Jefferson County. The authorization also changed the means of diversion from a headgate to a pump, the means of conveyance from a ditch to pipeline, and the type of irrigation from flood to sprinkler irrigation (Change No. 41G 30042994).

CHANGE PROPOSAL

FINDINGS OF FACT

3. The Applicants propose to change the POD for Statement of Claim No. 41G 120778 approximately 350-400 feet upstream and north of the currently authorized POD.
4. The new POD will utilize a pump and pipeline diversion located on the Applicants property in the SESWSE of Section 28, T2N, R4W, Jefferson County. There will be no change to the POU or pattern of use from what was previously authorized under Change No. 41G 30042994.

Figure 1: MAP OF PROPOSED PROJECT AREA (DEPARTMENT FILE)



CHANGE CRITERIA

5. The Department is authorized to approve a change if the applicant meets its burden to prove the applicable § 85-2-402, MCA, criteria by a preponderance of the evidence. Matter of Royston, 249 Mont. 425, 429, 816 P.2d 1054, 1057 (1991); Hohenlohe v. DNRC, 2010 MT 203, ¶¶ 33, 35, and 75, 357 Mont. 438, 240 P.3d 628 (an applicant's burden to prove change criteria by a preponderance of evidence is "more probably than not."); Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, 2012 MT 81, ¶8, 364 Mont. 450, 276 P.3d 920. Under this Preliminary Determination, the relevant change criteria in §85-2-402(2), MCA, are:

(2) Except as provided in subsections (4) through (6), (15), (16), and (18) and, if applicable, subject to subsection (17), the department shall approve a change in

appropriation right if the appropriator proves by a preponderance of evidence that the following criteria are met:

(a) The proposed change in appropriation right will not adversely affect the use of the existing water rights of other persons or other perfected or planned uses or developments for which a permit or certificate has been issued or for which a state water reservation has been issued under part 3.

(b) The proposed means of diversion, construction, and operation of the appropriation works are adequate, except for: (i) a change in appropriation right for instream flow pursuant to 85-2-320 or 85-2-436; (ii) a temporary change in appropriation right for instream flow pursuant to 85-2-408; or (iii) a change in appropriation right pursuant to 85-2-420 for mitigation or marketing for mitigation.

(c) The proposed use of water is a beneficial use.

(d) The applicant has a possessory interest, or the written consent of the person with the possessory interest, in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use or, if the proposed change involves a point of diversion, conveyance, or place of use on national forest system lands, the applicant has any written special use authorization required by federal law to occupy, use, or traverse national forest system lands for the purpose of diversion, impoundment, storage, transportation, withdrawal, use, or distribution of water. This subsection (2)(d) does not apply to: (i) a change in appropriation right for instream flow pursuant to 85-2-320 or 85-2-436; (ii) a temporary change in appropriation right for instream flow pursuant to 85-2-408; or (iii) a change in appropriation right pursuant to 85-2-420 for mitigation or marketing for mitigation.

6. The evaluation of a proposed change in appropriation does not adjudicate the underlying right(s). The Department's change process only addresses the water right holder's ability to make a different use of that existing right. E.g., Hohenlohe, at ¶¶ 29-31; Town of Manhattan, at ¶8; *In the Matter of Application to Change Appropriation Water Right No.41F-31227 by T-L Irrigation Company* (DNRC Final Order 1991).

HISTORIC USE AND ADVERSE EFFECT

FINDINGS OF FACT - Historic Use

7. Statement of Claim No. 41G 120778 was decreed in the Basin 41G Temporary Preliminary Decree by the Montana Water Court with a flow rate of 1.45 CFS and an unquantified volume not to exceed the amount put to historical and beneficial use. The place of use of Statement of Claim No. 41G 120778 was historically supplied via a headgate on Whitetail Deer Creek located in the NESWSW of Section 21, T2N, R4W in Jefferson County. From there water was diverted approximately 1 mile via Black Ditch to the POU where it flood irrigated 19.0 acres located in the SWSE of Section 28, T2N, R4W, Jefferson County. Black Ditch was filled in in the late 1970's due

to residential development in the area. In 1979 a pump was placed in the creek, so the ditch was no longer needed to convey water.

8. Change Authorization No. 41G 30042994 was submitted on August 12, 2008 and issued September 15, 2009, which authorized a change in the POD from the NESWSW of Section 21, T2N, R4W, to the NENWNE of Section 33, T2N, R4W, both in Jefferson County. The authorization also changed the means of diversion from a headgate to a pump, the means of conveyance from a ditch to pipeline, and the type of irrigation from flood to sprinkler irrigation (Change No. 41G 30042994).

9. There are no supplemental rights associated with this change.

10. Claim No. 41G 120778 has been used regularly since originally appropriated. There have been no periods of non-use.

11. Per ARM 36.12.1902, historic use will be the date of completion of the previous change, Change Authorization No. 41G 30042994. Change Authorization No 41G 30042994 was issued on September 15, 2009 and Certified by the Department on November 3, 2009) with a flow rate of 315 GPM to irrigate 19 acres via sprinkler irrigation. Based on the sprinkler system described in the beneficial use section below, a field efficiency of 65% was used in the previous change application, resulting in a diverted volume of 49.6 AF, and a consumed volume of 32.3 AF.

12. The Department found the following historic use of Claim No. 41G 120778 from May 1-October 31 of each year.

WR Claim #	Priority Date	Diverted Volume	Flow Rate	Purpose (Total Acres)	Consump. Use	Place of Use	Point of Diversion
120778	9/12/1902	49.6 AF	315 GPM (.70 cfs)	Sprinkler Irrigation 19 acres	32.3 acre feet	SWSE SEC 28, T2N, R4W	NENWNE SEC 33, T2N, R4W

FINDINGS OF FACT – Adverse Effect

13. The proposed appropriation of water will not increase or expand the use of Claim No. 41G 120778. The historical POU and method of sprinkler irrigation will not change, however, the POD will be moved approximately 350-400 feet upstream and north of the currently authorized POD

onto the Applicant's property. There are no other points of diversion between the old POD and the proposed POD.

14. The proposed pump is a Cornell 15hp motor, similar to the historical pump (Berkley Pump Model No. B2½T PMSJM, Century 15hp motor), to ensure that the total proposed flow rate of 315 gpm will not be exceeded.

15. The historical consumptive use and proposed consumptive use will not change and remain at 32.3 AF. (Change Authorization No. 41G 30042994)

16. The POU will remain unchanged, there is no change in pattern or timing of return flows.

17. The Applicants will not be able to call water rights they could not previously call. There will be no greater access to the water as a result of the proposed change.

BENEFICIAL USE

FINDINGS OF FACT

18. Applicant proposes to use water for irrigation which is recognized as a beneficial use under §85-2-102(2)(5), MCA

19. Applicant proposes to use 49.6 AF diverted volume and 315 GPM flow rate for irrigation of 19.0 acres that was authorized during a previous change issued September 15, 2009 and certified November 3, 2009 (Change Authorization No. 30042994). The previous change states that "water is pumped into a mainline and conveyed to a wheelline sprinkler. There are two laterals, one consisting of 30 nozzles and the other consisting of 15 nozzles. The nozzle size is 3/16" and according to the Aqua Tech representative the output is 7 gpm at 50 psi." "If both laterals are being used, at 50 psi the total flow rate through the sprinklers is 315 gpm. The total flow rate and volume is a net application of 1.70 ft/year (20.37 inches per year). This calculation is based on the crops grown, the approximate water holding capacity of the soil, physical configuration of the irrigation system, management and operational practices for the irrigation system." (Information Concerning Flow Rate Capability & Water Requirements and Consumptive Volume, Change No. 41G 30042994)

ADEQUATE DIVERSION

FINDINGS OF FACT

20. The Applicants will move the point of diversion to the SESWSE of Section 28, T2N, R4W, Jefferson County, approximately 350-400 feet upstream and north of the old POD. The means of diversion will be a 15 HP Cornell pump, which is similar to the Century 15 HP pump that was historically used to ensure that the flow rate will not exceed the historical use of 315 GPM and a max volume of 49.6 AF diverted volume.

POSSESSORY INTEREST

FINDINGS OF FACT

21. The applicant signed the affidavit on the application form affirming the applicant has possessory interest, in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use. (Department file)

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

HISTORIC USE AND ADVERSE EFFECT

22. Montana's change statute codifies the fundamental principles of the Prior Appropriation Doctrine. Sections 85-2-401 and -402(1)(a), MCA, authorize changes to existing water rights, permits, and water reservations subject to the fundamental tenet of Montana water law that one may change only that to which he or she has the right based upon beneficial use. A change to an existing water right may not expand the consumptive use of the underlying right or remove the well-established limit of the appropriator's right to water actually taken and beneficially used. An increase in consumptive use constitutes a new appropriation and is subject to the new water use permit requirements of the MWUA. McDonald v. State, 220 Mont. 519, 530, 722 P.2d 598, 605 (1986)(beneficial use constitutes the basis, measure, and limit of a water right); Featherman v. Hennessy, 43 Mont. 310, 316-17, 115 P. 983, 986 (1911)(increased consumption associated with expanded use of underlying right amounted to new appropriation rather than change in use); Quigley v. McIntosh, 110 Mont. 495, 103 P.2d 1067, 1072-74 (1940)(appropriator may not expand a water right through the guise of a change – expanded use constitutes a new use with a new priority date junior to intervening water uses); Allen v. Petrick, 69 Mont. 373, 222 P. 451(1924)(“quantity of water which may be claimed lawfully under a prior appropriation is limited to that quantity within the amount claimed which the appropriator has needed, and which within a reasonable time he has actually and economically applied to a beneficial use. . . . it may be said

that the principle of beneficial use is the one of paramount importance . . . The appropriator does not own the water. He has a right of ownership in its use only”); Town of Manhattan, at ¶ 10 (an appropriator’s right only attaches to the amount of water actually taken and beneficially applied); Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, Pg. 9 (2011)(the rule that one may change only that to which it has a right is a fundamental tenet of Montana water law and imperative to MWUA change provisions); In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. 41I 30002512 by Brewer Land Co, LLC, DNRC Proposal For Decision and Final Order (2004).¹

23. Sections 85-2-401(1) and -402(2)(a), MCA, codify the prior appropriation principles that Montana appropriators have a vested right to maintain surface and ground water conditions substantially as they existed at the time of their appropriation; subsequent appropriators may insist that prior appropriators confine their use to what was actually appropriated or necessary for their originally intended purpose of use; and, an appropriator may not change or alter its use in a manner that adversely affects another water user. Spokane Ranch & Water Co. v. Beatty, 37 Mont. 342, 96 P. 727, 731 (1908); Quigley, 110 Mont. at 505-11,103 P.2d at 1072-74; Matter of Royston, 249 Mont. at 429, 816 P.2d at 1057; Hohenlohe, at ¶¶43-45.²

24. The cornerstone of evaluating potential adverse effect to other appropriators is the determination of the “historic use” of the water right being changed. Town of Manhattan, at ¶10 (recognizing that the Department’s obligation to ensure that change will not adversely affect other water rights requires analysis of the actual historic amount, pattern, and means of water use). A change applicant must prove the extent and pattern of use for the underlying right proposed for change through evidence of the historic diverted amount, consumed amount, place of use, pattern of use, and return flow because a statement of claim, permit, or decree may not include the beneficial use information necessary to evaluate the amount of water available for change or

¹ DNRC decisions are available at:

http://www.dnrc.mt.gov/wrd/water_rts/hearing_info/hearing_orders/hearingorders.asp

² See also Holmstrom Land Co., Inc., v. Newlan Creek Water District, 185 Mont. 409, 605 P.2d 1060 (1979); Lokowich v. Helena, 46 Mont. 575, 129 P. 1063(1913); Thompson v. Harvey, 164 Mont. 133, 519 P.2d 963 (1974)(plaintiff could not change his diversion to a point upstream of the defendants because of the injury resulting to the defendants); McIntosh v. Graveley, 159 Mont. 72, 495 P.2d 186 (1972)(appropriator was entitled to move his point of diversion downstream, so long as he installed measuring devices to ensure that he took no more than would have been available at his original point of diversion); Head v. Hale, 38 Mont. 302, 100 P. 222 (1909)(successors of the appropriator of water appropriated for placer mining purposes cannot so change its use as to deprive lower appropriators of their rights, already acquired, in the use of it for irrigating purposes); and, Gassert v. Noyes, 18 Mont. 216, 44 P. 959(1896)(change in place of use was unlawful where reduced the amount of water in the source of supply available which was subject to plaintiff’s subsequent right).

potential for adverse effect.³ A comparative analysis of the historic use of the water right to the proposed change in use is necessary to prove the change will not result in expansion of the original right, or adversely affect water users who are entitled to rely upon maintenance of conditions on the source of supply for their water rights. Quigley, 103 P.2d at 1072-75 (it is necessary to ascertain historic use of a decreed water right to determine whether a change in use expands the underlying right to the detriment of other water user because a decree only provides a limited description of the right); Royston, 249 Mont. at 431-32, 816 P.2d at 1059-60 (record could not sustain a conclusion of no adverse effect because the applicant failed to provide the Department with evidence of the historic diverted volume, consumption, and return flow); Hohenlohe, at ¶44-45; Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, Pgs. 11-12 (proof of historic use is required even when the right has been decreed because the decreed flow rate or volume establishes the maximum appropriation that may be diverted, and may exceed the historical pattern of use, amount diverted or amount consumed through actual use); Matter of Application For Beneficial Water Use Permit By City of Bozeman, *Memorandum*, Pgs. 8-22 (Adopted by DNRC *Final Order* January 9, 1985)(evidence of historic use must be compared to the proposed change in use to give effect to the implied limitations read into every decreed right that an appropriator has no right to expand his appropriation or change his use to the detriment of juniors).⁴

³A claim only constitutes *prima facie* evidence for the purposes of the adjudication under § 85-2-221, MCA. The claim does not constitute *prima facie* evidence of historical use in a change proceeding under §85-2-402, MCA. For example, most water rights decreed for irrigation are not decreed with a volume and provide limited evidence of actual historic beneficial use. §85-2-234, MCA

⁴ Other western states likewise rely upon the doctrine of historic use as a critical component in evaluating changes in appropriation rights for expansion and adverse effect: Pueblo West Metropolitan District v. Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District, 717 P.2d 955, 959 (Colo. 1986)(“[O]nce an appropriator exercises his or her privilege to change a water right ... the appropriator runs a real risk of requantification of the water right based on actual historical consumptive use. In such a change proceeding a junior water right ... which had been strictly administered throughout its existence would, in all probability, be reduced to a lesser quantity because of the relatively limited actual historic use of the right.”); Santa Fe Trail Ranches Property Owners Ass'n v. Simpson, 990 P.2d 46, 55 -57 (Colo., 1999); Farmers Reservoir and Irr. Co. v. City of Golden, 44 P.3d 241, 245 (Colo. 2002)(“We [Colorado Supreme Court] have stated time and again that the need for security and predictability in the prior appropriation system dictates that holders of vested water rights are entitled to the continuation of stream conditions as they existed at the time they first made their appropriation); Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County, 53 P.3d 1165, 1170 (Colo. 2002); Wyo. Stat. § 41-3-104 (When an owner of a water right wishes to change a water right ... he shall file a petition requesting permission to make such a change The change ... may be allowed provided that the quantity of water transferred ... shall not exceed the amount of water historically diverted under the existing use, nor increase the historic rate of diversion under the existing use, nor increase the historic amount consumptively used under the existing use, nor decrease the historic amount of return flow, nor in any manner injure other existing lawful appropriators.); Basin Elec. Power Co-op. v. State Bd. of Control, 578 P.2d 557,

25. An applicant must also analyze the extent to which a proposed change may alter historic return flows for purposes of establishing that the proposed change will not result in adverse effect. The requisite return flow analysis reflects the fundamental tenant of Montana water law that once water leaves the control of the original appropriator, the original appropriator has no right to its use and the water is subject to appropriation by others. E.g., Hohenlohe, at ¶44; Rock Creek Ditch & Flume Co. v. Miller, 93 Mont. 248, 17 P.2d 1074, 1077 (1933); Newton v. Weiler, 87 Mont. 164, 286 P. 133(1930); Popham v. Holloron, 84 Mont. 442, 275 P. 1099, 1102 (1929); Galiger v. McNulty, 80 Mont. 339, 260 P. 401 (1927); Head v. Hale, 38 Mont. 302, 100 P. 222 (1909); Spokane Ranch & Water Co., 37 Mont. at 351-52, 96 P. at 731; Hidden Hollow Ranch v. Fields, 2004 MT 153, 321 Mont. 505, 92 P.3d 1185; In the Matter of Application for Change Authorization No. G (W)028708-411 by Hedrich/Straugh/Ringer, DNRC Final Order (Dec. 13, 1991); In the Matter of Application for Change Authorization No. G(W)008323-G76l By Starkel/Koester, DNRC Final Order (Apr. 1, 1992); In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. 411 30002512 by Brewer Land Co, LLC, DNRC Proposal For Decision and Final Order (2004); ARM 36.12.101(56)(Return flow - that part of a diverted flow which is not consumed by the appropriator and returns underground to its original source or another source of water - is not part of a water right and is subject to appropriation by subsequent water users).⁵

26. Although the level of analysis may vary, analysis of the extent to which a proposed change may alter the amount, location, or timing return flows is critical in order to prove that the proposed change will not adversely affect other appropriators who rely on those return flows as part of the source of supply for their water rights. Royston, 249 Mont. at 431, 816 P.2d at 1059-60; Hohenlohe, at ¶¶ 45-6 and 55-6; Spokane Ranch & Water Co., 37 Mont. at 351-52, 96 P. at 731. Noted Montana Water Law scholar Al Stone explained that the water right holder who seeks to change a water right is unlikely to receive the full amount claimed or historically used at the original place of use due to reliance upon return flows by other water users. Montana Water Law, Albert

564 -566 (Wyo,1978) (a water right holder may not effect a change of use transferring more water than he had historically consumptively used; regardless of the lack of injury to other appropriators, the amount of water historically diverted under the existing use, the historic rate of diversion under the existing use, the historic amount consumptively used under the existing use, and the historic amount of return flow must be considered.)

⁵ The Montana Supreme Court recently recognized the fundamental nature of return flows to Montana's water sources in addressing whether the Mitchell Slough was a perennial flowing stream, given the large amount of irrigation return flow which feeds the stream. The Court acknowledged that the Mitchell's flows are fed by irrigation return flows available for appropriation. Bitterroot River Protective Ass'n, Inc. v. Bitterroot Conservation Dist. 2008 MT 377, ¶¶ 22, 31, 43, 346 Mont. 508, ¶¶ 22, 31,43, 198 P.3d 219, ¶¶ 22, 31,43(citing Hidden Hollow Ranch v. Fields, 2004 MT 153, 321 Mont. 505, 92 P.3d 1185).

W. Stone, Pgs. 112-17 (State Bar of Montana 1994).

27. In Royston, the Montana Supreme Court confirmed that an applicant is required to prove lack of adverse effect through comparison of the proposed change to the historic use, historic consumption, and historic return flows of the original right. 249 Mont. at 431, 816 P.2d at 1059-60. More recently, the Montana Supreme Court explained the relationship between the fundamental principles of historic beneficial use, return flow, and the rights of subsequent appropriators as they relate to the adverse effect analysis in a change proceeding in the following manner:

The question of adverse effect under §§ 85-2-402(2) and -408(3), MCA, implicates return flows. A change in the amount of return flow, or to the hydrogeologic pattern of return flow, has the potential to affect adversely downstream water rights. There consequently exists an inextricable link between the “amount historically consumed” and the water that re-enters the stream as return flow. . . .

An appropriator historically has been entitled to the greatest quantity of water he can put to use. The requirement that the use be both beneficial and reasonable, however, proscribes this tenet. This limitation springs from a fundamental tenet of western water law—that an appropriator has a right only to that amount of water historically put to beneficial use—developed in concert with the rationale that each subsequent appropriator “is entitled to have the water flow in the same manner as when he located,” and the appropriator may insist that prior appropriators do not affect adversely his rights.

This fundamental rule of Montana water law has dictated the Department’s determinations in numerous prior change proceedings. The Department claims that historic consumptive use, as quantified in part by return flow analysis, represents a key element of proving historic beneficial use.

We do not dispute this interrelationship between historic consumptive use, return flow, and the amount of water to which an appropriator is entitled as limited by his past beneficial use.

Hohenlohe, at ¶¶ 42-45 (internal citations omitted).

28. The Department’s rules reflect the above fundamental principles of Montana water law and are designed to itemize the type evidence and analysis required for an applicant to meet its burden of proof. ARM 36.12.1901 through 1903. These rules forth specific evidence and analysis required to establish the parameters of historic use of the water right being changed. ARM 36.12.1901 and 1902. The rules also outline the analysis required to establish a lack of adverse effect based upon a comparison of historic use of the water rights being changed to the proposed use under the changed conditions along with evaluation of the potential impacts of the change on other water users caused by changes in the amount, timing, or location of historic diversions and return flows. ARM 36.12.1901 and 1903.

29. Applicant seeks to change existing water rights represented by its Water Right Claims. The “existing water rights” in this case are those as they existed prior to July 1, 1973, because with limited exception, no changes could have been made to those rights after that date without the Department’s approval. Analysis of adverse effect in a change to an “existing water right” requires evaluation of what the water right looked like and how it was exercised prior to July 1, 1973. In McDonald v. State, the Montana Supreme Court explained:

The foregoing cases and many others serve to illustrate that what is preserved to owners of appropriated or decreed water rights by the provision of the 1972 Constitution is what the law has always contemplated in this state as the extent of a water right: such amount of water as, by pattern of use and means of use, the owners or their predecessors put to beneficial use. . . . the Water Use Act contemplates that all water rights, regardless of prior statements or claims as to amount, must nevertheless, to be recognized, pass the test of historical, unabandoned beneficial use. . . . To that extent only the 1972 constitutional recognition of water rights is effective and will be sustained.

220 Mont. at 529, 722 P.2d at 604; see also Matter of Clark Fork River Drainage Area, 254 Mont. 11, 17, 833 P.2d 1120 (1992).

30. Water Resources Surveys were authorized by the 1939 legislature. 1939 Mont. Laws Ch. 185, § 5. Since their completion, Water Resources Surveys have been invaluable evidence in water right disputes and have long been relied on by Montana courts. In re Adjudication of Existing Rights to Use of All Water in North End Subbasin of Bitterroot River Drainage Area in Ravalli and Missoula Counties, 295 Mont. 447, 453, 984 P.2d 151, 155 (1999)(Water Resources Survey used as evidence in adjudicating of water rights); Wareing v. Schreckendgust, 280 Mont. 196, 213, 930 P.2d 37, 47 (1996)(Water Resources Survey used as evidence in a prescriptive ditch easement case); Olsen v. McQueary, 212 Mont. 173, 180, 687 P.2d 712, 716 (1984) (judicial notice taken of Water Resources Survey in water right dispute concerning branches of a creek).

31. While evidence may be provided that a particular parcel was irrigated, the actual amount of water historically diverted and consumed is critical. E.g., In the Matter of Application to Change Water Right No. 41H 1223599 by MGRR #1, LLC., DNRC Proposal for Decision adopted by Final Order (2005). The Department cannot assume that a parcel received the full duty of water or that it received sufficient water to constitute full service irrigation for optimum plant growth. Even when it seems clear that no other rights could be affected solely by a particular change in the location of diversion, it is essential that the change also not enlarge an existing right. See MacDonald,

220 Mont. at 529, 722 P.2d at 604; Featherman, 43 Mont. at 316-17, 115 P. at 986; Trail's End Ranch, L.L.C. v. Colorado Div. of Water Resources 91 P.3d 1058, 1063 (Colo., 2004).

32. The Department has adopted a rule providing for the calculation of historic consumptive use where the applicant proves by a preponderance of the evidence that the acreage was historically irrigated. ARM 36.12.1902 (16). In the alternative an applicant may present its own evidence of historic beneficial use. In this case the Applicant has elected to proceed under ARM 36.12.1902. (FOF Nos.11-12).

33. If an applicant seeks more than the historic consumptive use as calculated by ARM .36.12.1902 (16), the applicant bears the burden of proof to demonstrate the amount of historic consumptive use by a preponderance of the evidence. The actual historic use of water could be less than the optimum utilization represented by the calculated duty of water in any particular case. E.g., Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County 53 P.3d 1165 (Colo., 2002) (historical use must be quantified to ensure no enlargement); In the Matter of Application to Change Water Right No. 41H 1223599 by MGRR #1, LLC., supra; Orr v. Arapahoe Water and Sanitation Dist. 753 P.2d 1217, 1223 -1224 (Colo., 1988)(historical use of a water right could very well be less than the duty of water); Weibert v. Rothe Bros., Inc., 200 Colo. 310, 317, 618 P.2d 1367, 1371 - 1372 (Colo. 1980) (historical use could be less than the optimum utilization “duty of water”).

34. Based upon the Applicant's evidence of historic use, the Applicant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence the historic use of Water Right Claim No. 41G 120778 to be 49.6 AF diverted volume and 315 GPM flow rate with a consumptive use of 32.3 AF acre-feet. (FOF Nos. 7—12)

35. Based upon the Applicant's comparative analysis of historic water use and return flows to water use and return flows under the proposed change, the Applicant has proven that the proposed change in appropriation right will not adversely affect the use of the existing water rights of other persons or other perfected or planned uses or developments for which a permit or certificate has been issued or for which a state water reservation has been issued. §85-2-402(2)(b), MCA. (FOF Nos. 13—17)

BENEFICIAL USE

36. A change applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence the proposed use is a beneficial use. §§85-2-102(5) and -402(2)(c), MCA. Beneficial use is and has always been the hallmark of a valid Montana water right: “[T]he amount actually needed for beneficial use within the appropriation will be the basis, measure, and the limit of all water rights in Montana . . .” McDonald, 220 Mont. at 532, 722 P.2d at 606. The analysis of the beneficial use criterion is the same for change authorizations under §85-2-402, MCA, and new beneficial permits under §85-2-311, MCA. ARM 36.12.1801. The amount of water that may be authorized for change is limited to the amount of water necessary to sustain the beneficial use. E.g., Bitterroot River Protective Association v. Siebel, *Order on Petition for Judicial Review*, Cause No. BDV-2002-519, Montana First Judicial District Court (2003) (*affirmed on other grounds*, 2005 MT 60, 326 Mont. 241, 108 P.3d 518); Worden v. Alexander, 108 Mont. 208, 90 P.2d 160 (1939); Allen v. Petrick, 69 Mont. 373, 222 P. 451(1924); Sitz Ranch v. DNRC, DV-10-13390, Montana Fifth Judicial District Court, *Order Affirming DNRC Decision*, Pg. 3 (2011)(citing BRPA v. Siebel, 2005 MT 60, and rejecting applicant’s argument that it be allowed to appropriate 800 acre-feet when a typical year would require 200-300 acre-feet); Toohey v. Campbell, 24 Mont. 13, 60 P. 396 (1900)(“The policy of the law is to prevent a person from acquiring exclusive control of a stream, or any part thereof, not for present and actual beneficial use, but for mere future speculative profit or advantage, without regard to existing or contemplated beneficial uses. He is restricted in the amount that he can appropriate to the quantity needed for such beneficial purposes.”); §85-2-312(1)(a), MCA (DNRC is statutorily prohibited from issuing a permit for more water than can be beneficially used).

37. Applicant proposes to use water for irrigation which is a recognized beneficial use. §85-2-102(5), MCA. Applicant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence irrigation is a beneficial use and that 49.6 acre-feet of diverted volume and 315 GPM flow rate of water requested is the amount needed to sustain the beneficial use. §85-2-402(2)(c), MCA (FOF Nos. 18—19)

ADEQUATE MEANS OF DIVERSION

38. Pursuant to §85-2-402 (2)(b), MCA, the Applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed means of diversion, construction, and operation of the appropriation works are adequate. This codifies the prior appropriation principle that the means of diversion must be reasonably effective for the contemplated use and may not result in a waste of the resource. Crowley v. 6th Judicial District Court, 108 Mont. 89, 88 P.2d 23 (1939); In the Matter

of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 41C-11339900 by Three Creeks Ranch of Wyoming LLC (DNRC Final Order 2002)(information needed to prove that proposed means of diversion, construction, and operation of the appropriation works are adequate varies based upon project complexity; design by licensed engineer adequate).

39. Pursuant to §85-2-402 (2)(b), MCA, applicant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed means of diversion, construction, and operation of the appropriation works are adequate for the proposed beneficial use. (FOF No. 20)

POSSESSORY INTEREST

40. Pursuant to §85-2-402(2)(d), MCA, the Applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it has a possessory interest, or the written consent of the person with the possessory interest, in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use. See also ARM 36.12.1802

41. The Applicant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it has a possessory interest, or the written consent of the person with the possessory interest, in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use. (FOF No. 21)

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION

Subject to the terms and analysis in this Preliminary Determination Order, the Department preliminarily determines that this Application to Change Water Right No. 41G 30111445 should be granted. The Department authorizes the Applicant to change the POD for Statement of Claim 41G 120778. The authorized point of diversion will be located in the SESWSE of Section 28, T2N, R4W, Jefferson County, approximately 350-400 feet upstream and north of the old POD.

NOTICE

This Department will provide public notice of this Application and the Department's Preliminary Determination to Grant pursuant to §85-2-307, MCA. The Department will set a deadline for objections to this Application pursuant to §§85-2-307, and -308, MCA. If this Application receives a valid objection, it will proceed to a contested case proceeding pursuant to Title 2 Chapter 4 Part 6, MCA, and §85-2-309, MCA. If this Application receives no valid objection or all valid objections are unconditionally withdrawn, the Department will grant this Application as

herein approved. If this Application receives a valid objection(s) and the valid objection(s) are conditionally withdrawn, the Department will consider the proposed condition(s) and grant the Application with such conditions as the Department decides necessary to satisfy the applicable criteria. E.g., §§85-2-310, -312, MCA.

DATED this _____ day of _____ 20__.

/Original signed by Jennifer Daly/
Jennifer Daly, Acting Regional Manager
Helena Regional Office
Department of Natural Resources
and Conservation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This certifies that a true and correct copy of the PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION TO GRANT was served upon all parties listed below on this ____ day of _____ 20__, by first class United States mail.

CHARLES J. WIDEMAN & DEBRA L. HANNERMAN TRUST
107 WHITETAIL RD.
WHITEHALL MT 59759

Regional Office, (406) 444-6999